

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,723	11/25/2003	Michael P. Corcoran	C516.12-0005	5761
164 7590 12/11/2007 KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.			EXAMINER	
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING 312 SOUTH THIRD STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002			TRUONG, KI	EVIN THAO
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WINNEAT OF	5, WII 4 55-15-1602		3734	<u> </u>
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	H ·			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
•	10/721,723	CORCORAN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	7	
	Kevin T. Truong	3734		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timution and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Section 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 24 Section 24 Section 25 Section 25 Section 26 Secti	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Aug. 4				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Note: This is in response to an amendment filed 09/24/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066) and further in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066).
- 3. As to claims 1, 2, 6-14, 37, 38, and 41-48, Maahs discloses the claimed invention in figures 6-8 and 11, an occlusion device (70) comprises a plurality of ribs (72) extending from the proximal end of the center post (62) to the distal end of the center post (62); and a foam sheet (82) attached to the plurality of ribs (72,75). Note that Maahs described in figures 6, 7, and 16, the frame of filter (70) having a greater diameter at its proximal end than its distal end. As a result, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make a diameter of ribs (72) near the proximal end of the center post (62) greater than a diameter of the ribs (72) near the distal end of the center post. Since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,723

Art Unit: 3734

- 4. Claims 3, 4, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066). Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a first segment including a pin and second segment including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Tanner et al teaches in figure 2A, that it is known in the surgical art to have center post (10) comprises a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Maahs center post by substituting for the center post having a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment as taught by Tanner et al. in order to permits expansion of the vessel necks and/or ends without negatively impacting the connection between the graft and the vessel wall.
- 5. Claims 5, 15-17, 20-27, and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066). Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs attach. Corcoran et al teaches in figures 2 and 15, that it is known in the surgical art to have the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs passing through the holes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Maahs center post with holes located at its ends to which the ribs can be

Application/Control Number: 10/721,723

// Control Hamber: To// 21,/2

Art Unit: 3734

passed through as taught by Corcoran so that it is less likely to be sheared off or permanently linked since the edges of the hole are beveled or rounded.

6. Claims 18, 19, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066) and further in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066).

Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs attach and the center post comprises a first segment including a pin and second segment including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Corcoran et al teaches in figures 2 and 15, that it is known in the surgical art to have the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs passing through the holes. Tanner et al teaches in figure 2A, that it is known in the surgical art to have center post (10) comprises a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Maahs center post with holes located at its ends to which the ribs can be passed through as taught by Corcoran so that it is less likely to be sheared off or permanently linked since the edges of the hole are beveled or rounded and furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Maahs center post by substituting for the center post having a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment as taught by Tanner et al. in

order to permits expansion of the vessel necks and/or ends without negatively impacting the connection between the graft and the vessel wall.

Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/24/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 15, 26, and 37 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 8. In response to applicant's argument that Maahs discloses a blood filter device for used in blood vessel to capture embolic material and not preferably shaped to fit into the LAA as described in the present invention, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/721,723 Page 6

Art Unit: 3734

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on 571-272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin T. Truond
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3734